

REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office Action mailed on January 11, 2008, Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 8 and 16, and canceled claim 2.

According to Office Action, claims 10-20 are allowed. The Examiner also indicated that claims 2, 3 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent forms including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejections is respectfully requested.

Specification and claim objections

The Examiner objected the specification at page 1, line 14 and claim 16 due to informalities. Applicants have corrected the specification and amended claim 16 and request that the rejection be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection of claims 1, 4-7 and 9

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-7, and 9 were rejected as being anticipated by Feltz et al. (US 20020098333).

Claim 1 has been amended to include the material composition of previously pending claim 2 which the Examiner indicated would be allowable. More particularly, independent claim 1, as amended, is directed to a piezoelectric component that includes ceramic layers comprising a material having a composition of $\text{Pb}_{0.988}\text{V}_{0.012}(\text{Zr}_{0.504+x}\text{Ti}_{0.472-x}\text{Nb}_{0.024})\text{O}_{3.000}$, where $-0.05 \leq x \leq 0.05$.

The Examiner has indicated that the prior art does not disclose or suggest the ceramic layers include a material having a composition of $\text{Pb}_{0.988}\text{V}_{0.012}(\text{Zr}_{0.504+x}\text{Ti}_{0.472-x}\text{Nb}_{0.024})\text{O}_{3.000}$, where $-0.05 \leq x \leq 0.05$ (Office Action page 5 item 14). Therefore, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over Feltz.

Claim 3-9 depend directly from claim 1 and allowable for the reasoning given in claim 1.

Summary

In view of the foregoing remarks, applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the examiner's earliest convenience.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons for which the claims on which they depend are patentable.

Canceled claims, if any, have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has (a) addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner, (b) made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims, or (c) amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant's undersigned attorney can be reached at the address shown below. All telephone calls should be directed to the undersigned at 617-956-5986.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

April 10, 2008



Tonya S. Drake
Reg. No. 57,861

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906